

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT
LITIGATION

Case No. 23-md-03084-CRB (LJC)

This Document Relates To:

ALL CASES.

**ORDER REGARDING PROTOCOL
FOR INSPECTION OF POLICY
HYPERLINKS**

Re: Dkt. No. 2595

The Court recently issued an Order setting protocols for production of hyperlinked policy-related documents. Dkt. No. 2607. The Court now addresses the parties' competing proposals for an inspection of such documents.

The Court previously contemplated an inspection of policy documents and related documents hyperlinked from those documents on Uber's systems, overseen by Special Master Jones. Dkt. No. 2545 at 6. The Court noted that a successful negotiation for production of such documents might obviate the need for the inspection. *Id.* Plaintiffs propose an inspection to occur before April 2, 2025, with access to certain policy documents that Plaintiffs will specify (and related documents linked from those documents) on Uber's systems that house those documents. Dkt. No. 2595-1 at 2–3. Uber proposes that the Special Master should determine whether an inspection is necessary at all, and that if it is, it should be a narrowly constrained tutorial conducted at defense counsel's office. Dkt. No. 2595-2 at 3–6.

The Court concludes that the Special Master is best situated to set the terms of an inspection she will be responsible for overseeing, after sufficient time to assess the effectiveness of the document production protocols the Court previously ordered. If Plaintiffs continue to believe an inspection is necessary, they may file a motion directed to the Special Master on April 18, 2025. Uber may file a response on April 22, 2025. The Court declines to constrain Judge

1 Jones's discretion as to the specific format of an inspection of hyperlinked policy-related
2 documents suitable to address any issues or gaps that remain after the document production
3 protocols have been tested. Judge Jones is further empowered to determine, if she sees fit, that no
4 inspection is necessary.

5 The parties should be prepared to proceed with an inspection during the first full week of
6 May if Judge Jones so orders, but Judge Jones may set a different date if she so chooses.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: March 25, 2025

9
10 
11 LISA J. CISNEROS
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28